

the values and principles fundamental to our endeavor to preserve and realize the promise of our constitutional democracy. I wish these young "constitutional experts" the best of luck at the We the People national finals and continued success in their endeavors.

HONORING THE NEIGHBOR-TO-NEIGHBOR FUND

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an organization dedicated to providing quality healthcare to the citizens of San Miguel County. The Uncompahgre Medical Center in Norwood, Colorado has developed the Neighbor-to-Neighbor fund, an innovative approach to funding the unexpected medical needs of the surrounding communities.

While the Medical Center's sliding fee and indigent care programs already assist the forty-percent of patients who are not insured, the fund, consisting entirely of individual contributions, covers one-time, small-scale medical and emergency needs otherwise out of reach for patients. Operating with no administrative costs, one hundred percent of contributions to the Neighbor-to-Neighbor Fund go to help San Miguel County residents in medical need. Only doctors and physician's assistants write checks on the fund, ensuring that the money serves as an instant tool for filling gaps in medical care. The fund, while usually holding less than \$1000, can cover numerous essentials, from a simple brace to fixing a serious dental problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to recognize the Uncompahgre Medical Center for its creativity in addressing difficult health care problems before this body of Congress and this nation. The Neighbor-to-Neighbor Fund is making a big difference in community health care with a small amount of money.

AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the American Sovereignty Restoration Act. I submitted this bill, which would end United States membership in the United Nations, in the 107th Congress and the 106th Congress and since then conditions have made its relevance and importance more evident now than ever. The United Nations assault on the sovereignty of the United States proceeds apace; it shows no signs of slowing. Mr. Speaker, since I last introduced this measure, the United Nations has convened its International Criminal Court, which claims jurisdiction even over citizens of countries that have not elected to join the court. This means that Americans—both civilians and members of our armed services—are subject to a court that even its supporters admit does not offer all the protections guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The United States continues to pay the lion's share of the U.N. budget, yet it is routinely kicked off committees like the Human Rights Committee by some of the most egregious of human rights abusing countries. This is absurd and we shouldn't have to pay for it.

As the United States faces another undeclared war for the United Nations—as is specified in the authorization for the use of force against Iraq (Public Law 107-243)—it is past time that we return to the principles of our founding fathers.

This legislation would represent a comprehensive and complete U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. It repeals the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and other related laws. It directs the President to terminate U.S. participation in the United Nations, including any organ, specialized agency, commission, or other affiliated body. It requires closure of the U.S. Mission to the U.N.

The legislation also prohibits the authorization of funds for the U.S. assessed or voluntary contribution to the U.N.; the authorization of funds for any U.S. contribution to any U.N. military operation; and the expenditure of funds to support the participation of U.S. armed forces as part of any U.N. military or peacekeeping operation. Finally, this legislation bars U.S. armed forces from serving under U.N. command.

The U.S. Congress, by passing H.R. 1146, and the U.S. president, by signing H.R. 1146, will heed the wise counsel of our first president, George Washington, when he advised his countrymen to "steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world," lest the nation's security and liberties be compromised by endless and overriding international commitments. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and I hope for its quick consideration.

In considering the recent United Nations meetings and the United States' relation to that organization and its affront to U.S. sovereignty, we would all do well to again read carefully Professor Herbert W. Titus' paper on the United Nations from which I have provided this excerpt:

It is commonly assumed that the Charter of the United Nations is a treaty. It is not. Instead, the Charter of the United Nations is a constitution. As such, it is illegitimate, having created a supranational government, deriving its powers not from the consent of the governed (the people of the United States of America and peoples of other member nations) but from the consent of the peoples' government officials who have no authority to bind either the American people nor any other nation's people to any terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

By definition, a treaty is a contract between or among independent and sovereign nations, obligatory on the signatories only when by competent governing authorities in accordance with the powers constitutionally conferred upon them. I Kent, Commentaries on American Law 163 (1826); Burdick, The Law of the American Constitution section 34 (1922) Even the United Nations Treaty Collection states that a treaty is (1) a binding instrument creating legal rights and duties (2) concluded by states or international organizations with treaty-making powers (3) governed by international law.

By contrast, a charter is a constitution creating a civil government for a unified nation or nations and establishing the authority of that government. Although the United Nations Treaty Collection defines a 'charter' as a 'constituent treaty,' leading inter-

national political authorities state that '[t]he use of the word 'Charter' [in reference to the founding document of the United Nations] . . . emphasizes the constitutional nature of this instrument.' Thus, the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations declares 'that the Peoples of the United Nations have resolved to combine their efforts to accomplish certain aims by certain means.' The Charter of the United Nations: A Commentary 46 (B. Simma, ed.) (Oxford Univ. Press, NY: 1995) (Hereinafter U.N. Charter Commentary). Consistent with this view, leading international legal authorities declare that the law of the Charter of the United Nations which governs the authority of the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Security Council is 'similar . . . to national constitutional law,' proclaiming that 'because of its status as a constitution for the world community,' the Charter of the United Nations must be construed broadly, making way for 'implied powers' to carry out the United Nations' 'comprehensive scope of duties, especially the maintenance of international peace and security and its orientation towards international public welfare.' *Id.* at 27.

The United Nations Treaty Collection confirms the appropriateness of this 'constitutional interpretive' approach to the Charter of the United Nations with its statement that the charter may be traced 'back to the Magna Carta (the Great Charter) of 1215,' a national constitutional document. As a constitutional document, the Magna Carta not only bound the original signatories, the English barons and the king, but all subsequent English rulers, including Parliament, conferring upon all Englishmen certain rights that five hundred years later were claimed and exercised by the English people who had colonized America.

A charter, then, is a covenant of the people and the civil rulers of a nation in perpetuity. Sources of Our Liberties 1-10 (R. Perry, ed.) (American Bar Foundation: 1978) As Article I of Magna Carta, puts it:

We have granted moreover to all free men of our kingdom for us and our heirs forever all liberties written below, to be had and holden by themselves and their heirs from us and our heirs.

In like manner, the Charter of the United Nations is considered to be a permanent 'constitution for the universal society,' and consequently, to be construed in accordance with its broad and unchanging ends but in such a way as to meet changing times and changing relations among the nations and peoples of the world. U.N. Charter Commentary at 28-44.

According to the American political and legal tradition and the universal principles of constitution making, a perpetual civil covenant or constitution, obligatory on the people and their rulers throughout the generations, must, first, be proposed in the name of the people and, thereafter, ratified by the people's representatives elected and assembled for the sole purpose of passing on the terms of a proposed covenant. See 4 The Founders' Constitution 647-58 (P. Kurland and R. Lerner, eds.) (Univ. Chicago. Press: 1985). Thus, the preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America begins with 'We the People of the United States' and Article VII provides for ratification by state conventions composed of representatives of the people elected solely for that purpose. Sources of Our Liberties 408, 416, 418-21 (R. Perry, ed.) (ABA Foundation, Chicago: 1978).

Taking advantage of the universal appeal of the American constitutional tradition, the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations opens with 'We the peoples of the United Nations.' But, unlike the Constitution of the United States of America, the